

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-10, 12-22, 24-27, and 29-34 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13, and 26 are the independent claims.

Claims 11, 23, and 28 have been cancelled. Claims 24, 33, and 34 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

The Office Action objected to certain of the drawings for failing to include a legend such as "Prior Art." In response, Applicant has submitted concurrently herewith a replacement drawing sheets with amended FIGS. 1 and 2. Amended FIGS. 1 and 2 have been amended to include the legend "Conventional Art."

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to claims 24, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 1.75(a). In response, Applicant has amended these claims in view of the Examiner's comments.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11-13, 16, 18-20, 23, 25-30, 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being anticipated by G. B. Patent No. 2371386 (Hewitt). Claims 2, 14, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,804 (Ip). Claims 3, 15, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040061892 (Ferlitsch). Claims 5 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,492 (Karaki). Claims 9, 10, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,681,642 (Sugisaki et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 13 now variously recite, inter alia, an image data controller in a first image processor.

Independent claim 26 now recites, inter alia, an image data controller disposed in a first image processor that includes the first image data generator.

It is to be appreciated that independent claims 1, 13, and 26 have been amended to recite various features of cancelled claims 11, 23, and 28.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the asserted citations, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the aforementioned features. Accordingly, the asserted combinations are likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Hewitt relates to load balancing for raster image processing across a printing system and discusses an arrangement including a printer formatter 24, a printer I/O 28, and a print engine 26. (Hewitt, FIGS. 1 and 2).

The Office Action contends that the printer formatter 24 is a first image processor and that either the printer I/O 28 or the print engine 26 is an image data controller. (Office Action, pages 4-6). The latter contention is respectfully traversed.

A review of FIGS. 1 and 2 of Hewitt reveals that neither the printer I/O 28 nor the print engine 26 are in the printer formatter 24 (the alleged first image processor). Thus, neither the printer I/O 28 nor the print engine 26 meet the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 13, and 24.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejections under 103, the secondary citations are cited for their alleged disclosures of various features of various independent claims. It is respectfully submitted that none of the secondary citations adds anything to the teachings or suggestions of Hewitt that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7-9-07

By: Michael E. Kondoudis  
Michael E. Kondoudis  
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes amended FIGS. 1 and 2. The sheet replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 1 and 2. The amended FIGS 1 and 2 have now been labeled as "Conventional Art" in response to an objection in the Office Action. No new matter is being added.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.